



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

statute required railroad companies to furnish certain appliances and expressly provided, that on injury resulting from failure to do so, the defence of assumed risk should not be available to the railway company. The court nevertheless permitted the defence of contributory negligence to be introduced.

PLATS—STATUTORY DEDICATION—INSUFFICIENT CERTIFICATE AND ACKNOWLEDGMENT.—Under the laws of the state of Illinois, which provided that when an addition was surveyed and a plat made and certified by the county surveyor and acknowledged by the proprietor the fee to the streets and alleys would pass to the city, it was *held* that a plat made and certified by a *deputy* surveyor and acknowledged by the *agent* of the proprietor was insufficient to constitute a statutory dedication. *Wilder v. Aurora, etc., Traction Co.* (1905), — Ill. —, 75 N. E. Rep. 194.

While this is according to precedent in Illinois (*Village of Auburn v. Goodwin*, 128 Ill. 57, overruling *Gebhardt v. Reeves*, 75 Ill. 305; *Thompson v. Maloney*, 199 Ill. 276) it seems somewhat arbitrary. A more satisfactory result could be obtained by applying the following rule, proposed by Judge Elliott (ROADS AND STREETS, § 119), "to resolve doubts in such cases against the donor, and within reasonable limits to construe the dedication so as to benefit the public rather than the donor.", or, as expressed by Dillon in his MUNICIPAL CORPORATIONS (note 2 § 628), "If the plat as recorded * * * contains enough to show that it was intended by the owner to be a dedication under the statute, it would seem to the author to be right, notwithstanding a defective acknowledgment or the like, to hold the proprietor estopped to make the objection that he did not comply with the statute." See *Ragan v. McCoy*, 29 Mo. 356.

PLEADING—DISCREPANCY BETWEEN TITLE AND AVERMENTS OF A COMPLAINT.—In the title of the complaint defendant is named only, in his individual capacity, but in the complaint itself a cause of action is stated against him in his representative capacity. Upon a demurrer that the complaint does not state a cause of action, *held*, that the demurrer should be sustained. (Werner and Bartlett, JJ., dissent.). *Leonard v. Pierce et al.* (1905), — N. Y. —, 75 N. E. Rep. 313.

Courts have frequently held that the title and pleadings may be considered together to determine the capacity in which a party sues or is sued. *Stilwell v. Carpenter*, 62 N. Y. 639, in full in 2 Abb. (N. C.) 238; *Jennings v. Wright*, 54 Ga. 537; *Rich v. Sowles*, 64 Vt. 408; *Beers v. Shannon*, 73 N. Y. 292. Thus where a party's name appears in the title, followed by words *descriptio personæ*, and the complaint clearly states a cause of action against or for him as an individual, the affix to his name in the title is treated as surplusage. *Stilwell v. Carpenter* (supra); *Litchfield v. Flint*, 104 N. Y. 543, 550. And, when under a similar title, the complaint states a cause of action against the party in a representative capacity, the action is against him in that capacity. *Beers v. Shannon*, 73 N. Y. 292; *Knox v. Met. El. Ry. Co.*, 58 Hun (Sup. Ct. N. Y.) 517, affirmed 128 N. Y. 625. In the principal case, a majority of the court refused to take a step further and disregard an entire omission of the *officio designata* in the title. They rely upon the case of *First Nat. Bank v. Shuler*,